



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/543,442 04/05/00 KADIU

M

MAKSIM KADIU
19694 AUBURN DRIVE
CUPERTINO CA 19694

PM82/0803

EXAMINER

HARTMANN, G
ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3673
DATE MAILED:

08/03/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/543,442

Applicant(s)

KADIU, MAKSIM

Examiner

Gary Hartmann

Art Unit

3673

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 April 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. —

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. An examination of this application reveals that applicant is unfamiliar with patent prosecuting procedure. While an inventor may prosecute the application, lack of skill in this field usually acts as a liability in affording the maximum protection for the invention disclosed. Applicant is advised to secure the services of a registered patent attorney or agent to prosecute the application, since the value of a patent is largely dependent upon skillful preparation and prosecution. The Office cannot aid in selecting an attorney or agent.

Applicant is advised of the availability of the publication "Attorneys and Agents Registered to Practice Before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office." This publication is for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference signs not mentioned in the description: 1, 9, 14B, 21, 24, 25A, 25B, 48A, 48B, 49, 54. Correction is required.

Specification

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is not on a separate sheet and there are misspellings therein. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the listing of patents under "Cross-Reference to Related Applications" is improper because the present application is

Art Unit: 3673

not entitled to priority from any of those applications. It appears that the list is intended to be an Information Disclosure Statement; however, this listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered. Additionally, there are misspellings and improper legal phraseology used in the specification. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 3 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim must refer to other claims in the alternative only (i.e., "or"). See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, **the claim has not been further treated on the merits.**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1, 2, and 4-15 are rejected as failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

7. The claims are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. The structure which goes to make up the device must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and correlated in such a manner as to present a

Art Unit: 3673

complete operative device. The claims must be in one sentence form only. Note the format of the claims in the patents cited.

8. The claims are failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors. The claims include numerous limitations lacking antecedent bases, including, but not necessarily limited to: "said linear rail posts," "the vertical members," and "these lasts" in lines 2, 13, and 13, respectively of claim 1; "said corner rail posts" in line 1 of claim 2; "said slide rail shoring system" and "the connection" in line 1 of claim 4; "their lateral ends" and "the connections" in line 1 of claim 11; "the cutting edge" in line 1 of claim 12; "the top and the bottom" in line 2 of claim 13; and "the top," "the shoring panel" in line 1 of claim 15. Additionally, the terms "large" and "small" are indefinite because they are relative terms undefined by the specification. The term "uniquely" (claim 1) is unclear since what is unique within the composition is undefined. The phrases "analogically to telescopic concept" and "until the cutting edge" are not clearly defined limitations. The term "or other materials" is indefinite because it is unclear what materials are and are not within the scope of the limitations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 2, 12, 15, and 7 (as it depends from 2) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hess (U.S. Patent 5,310,289). Hess discloses a device including rail

Art Unit: 3673

posts (1, 2) having a channel (3) and shoring panels (4, 5) sliding therein. The number of rail posts and panels is inherently left to one skilled in the art, and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used at least four rail posts and eight panels in order to brace a trench extending at least four times a panel width.

11. Claims 4 and 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stocker et al. (U.S. Patent 4,960,258). Stocker et al. disclose a device having a magnetic connection (via 28) between a rail post (4) and a panel (2). Regarding placement of the magnetic bars, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have placed the bars in any place necessary in order to obtain a desired post and panel connection. Note that while the disclosure Stocker et al. is not a trench shoring device, there are no limitations present in claims 4 and 11-15 that distinguish between the device of Stocker et al. and a trench shoring device. In order for the claims to be patentably distinguishable from Stocker et al., they must positively recite structure specific to a trench shoring device.

Allowable Subject Matter

12. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8-10, and 7 (as it depends from 1) would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action; provided the limitation of the magnetic flat bars is included and positively recited (i.e., "and/or" (line 8) should be changed to --and--).

Art Unit: 3673

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Fukumori, Hess et al., Jennings et al., Cooper, Sutton et al., Krings, West, Jr., Bryan, Benintend, Kannenberg, Wicke, and Herrick et al. teach trench shoring systems; and Callas teaches a magnetic support.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary Hartmann whose telephone number is 703-305-4549. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Will can be reached on 703-308-3870. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3597 for regular communications and 703-305-3597 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.



Gary Hartmann
Examiner
Art Unit 3673

gh
July 30, 2001

Attachment: Copies of 37 CFR 1.111-1.121; MPEP 608.01 (i); MPEP 608.01 (m)

§ 1.111 Reply by applicant or patent owner.

(a) After the Office action, if adverse in any respect, the applicant or patent owner, if he or she persists in his or her application for a patent or reexamination proceeding, must reply thereto and may request reconsideration or further examination, with or without amendment.

(b) In order to be entitled to reconsideration or further examination, the applicant or patent owner must

make request therefor in writing. The reply by the applicant or patent owner must distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action and must respond to every ground of objection and rejection in the prior Office action. If the reply is with respect to an application, a request may be made that objections or requirements as to form not necessary to further consideration of the claims be held in abeyance until allowable subject matter is indicated. The applicant's or patent owner's reply must appear throughout to be a bona fide attempt to advance the case to final action. A general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements of this section.

(c) In amending in response to a rejection of claims in an application or patent undergoing reexamination, the applicant or patent owner must clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. He or she must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections. (See § 1.135 and § 1.136 for time for reply.)

[46 FR 29182, May 29, 1981]

§ 1.112 Reconsideration.

After response by applicant or patent owner (§ 1.111), the application or patent under reexamination will be reconsidered and again examined. The applicant or patent owner will be notified if claims are rejected, or objections or requirements made, in the same manner as after the first examination. Applicant or patent owner may respond to such Office action in the same manner provided in § 1.111, with or without amendment. Any amendments after the second Office action must ordinarily be restricted to the rejection or to the objections or requirements made. The application or patent under reexamination will be again considered, and so on repeatedly, unless the examiner has indicated that the action is final.

[46 FR 29182, May 29, 1981; revised, 61 FR 42790, Aug. 19, 1996, effective Sept. 23, 1996]

§ 1.113 Final rejection or action.

(a) On the second or any subsequent examination or consideration the rejection or other action may be made final whereupon applicant's or patent owner's response is limited to appeal in the case of rejection of any claim (§ 1.191), or to amendment as specified in § 1.116. Petition may be taken to the Commissioner in the case of objections or requirements not involved in the rejection of any claim (§ 1.181). Response to a final rejection or action must include cancellation of, or appeal from the rejection of, each rejected claim. If any claim stands allowed, the response to a final rejection or action must comply with any requirements or objections to form.

(b) In making such final rejection, the examiner shall repeat or state all grounds of rejection then considered applicable to the claims in the case, clearly stating the reasons therefor.

[24 FR 10332, Dec. 22, 1959; 46 FR 29182, May 29, 1981]

AMENDMENTS

§ 1.115 Amendment.

The applicant may amend before or after the first examination and action and also after the second or subsequent examination or reconsideration as specified in § 1.112 or when and as specifically required by the examiner. The patent owner may amend in accordance with § 1.510(e) and 1.530(b) prior to reexamination and during reexamination proceedings in accordance with § 1.112 and § 1.116.

[46 FR 29183, May 29, 1981]

§ 1.116 Amendments after final action.

(a) After final rejection or action (§ 1.113) amendments may be made canceling claims or complying with any requirement of form which has been made. Amendments presenting rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal may be admitted. The admission of, or refusal to admit, any amendment after final rejection, and any proceedings relative thereto, shall not operate to relieve the application or patent under reexamination from its condition as subject to appeal or to save the application from abandonment under § 1.135.

(b) If amendments touching the merits of the application or patent under reexamination are presented after final rejection, or after appeal has been taken, or when such amendment might not otherwise be proper, they may be admitted upon a showing of good and sufficient reasons why they are necessary and were not earlier presented.

(c) No amendment can be made as a matter of right in appealed cases. After decision on appeal, amendments can only be made as provided in § 1.198, or to carry into effect a recommendation under § 1.196.

[24 FR 10332, Dec. 22, 1959; 46 FR 29183, May 29, 1981]

§ 1.117 Amendment and revision required.

The specification, claims, and drawings must be amended and revised when required to correct inaccuracies of description and definition or unnecessary prolixity, and to secure correspondence between the claims, the specification, and the drawing.

§ 1.118 Amendment of disclosure.

(a) No amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of an application after the filing date of the application (§ 1.53(b)). All amendments to the specification, including the claims, and the drawings filed after the filing date of the application must conform to at least one of them as it was at the time of the filing of the application. Matter not found in either, involving a departure from or an addition to the original disclosure, cannot be added to the application after its filing date even though supported by an oath or declaration in accordance with § 1.63 or § 1.67 filed after the filing date of the application.

(b) If it is determined that an amendment filed after the filing date of the application introduces new matter, claims containing new matter will be rejected and deletion of the new matter in the specification and drawings will be required even if the amendment is accompanied by an oath or declaration in accordance with § 1.63 or § 1.67.

[48 FR 2712, Jan. 20, 1983, effective Feb. 27, 1983]

§ 1.119 Amendment of claims.

The claims may be amended by canceling particular claims, by presenting new claims, or by rewriting particular claims as indicated in § 1.121. The requirements of § 1.111 must be complied with by pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims patentable over the references in presenting arguments in support of new claims and amendments.

[32 FR 13583, Sept. 28, 1967]

§ 1.121 Manner of making amendments.

(a) Erasures, additions, insertions, or alterations of the Office file of papers and records must not be physically entered by the applicant. Amendments to the application (excluding the claims) are made by filing a paper (which should conform to § 1.52) directing or requesting that specified amendments be made. The exact word or words to be stricken out or inserted by said amendment must be specified and the precise point indicated where the deletion or insertion is to be made.

(b) Except as otherwise provided herein, a particular claim may be amended only by directions to cancel or by rewriting such claim with underlining below the word or words added and brackets around the word or words deleted. The rewriting of a claim in this form will be

construed as directing the cancellation of the original claim; however, the original claim number followed by the parenthetical word "amended" must be used for the rewritten claim. If a previously rewritten claim is rewritten, underlining and bracketing will be applied in reference to the previously rewritten claim with the parenthetical expression "twice amended," "three times amended," etc., following the original claim number.

(c) A particular claim may be amended in the manner indicated for the application in paragraph (a) of this section to the extent of corrections in spelling, punctuation, and typographical errors. Additional amendments in this manner will be admitted provided the changes are limited to (1) deletions and/or (2) the addition of no more than five words in any one claim. Any amendment submitted with instructions to amend particular claims but failing to conform to the provisions of paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section may be considered nonresponsive and treated accordingly.

(d) Where underlining or brackets are intended to appear in the printed patent or are properly part of the claimed material and not intended as symbolic of changes in the particular claim, amendment by rewriting in accordance with paragraph (b) of this section shall be prohibited.

(e) In reissue applications, both the descriptive portion and the claims are to be amended by either (1) submitting a copy of a portion of the description or an entire claim with all matter to be deleted from the patent being placed between brackets and all matter to be added to the patent being underlined, or (2) indicating the exact word or words to be stricken out or inserted and the precise point where the deletion or insertion is to be made. Any word or words to be inserted must be underlined. See § 1.173.

(f) Proposed amendments presented in patents involved in reexamination proceedings must be presented in the form of a full copy of the text of: (1) Each claim which is amended and (2) each paragraph of the description which is amended. Matter deleted from the patent shall be placed between brackets and matter added shall be underlined. Copies of the printed claims from the patent may be used with any additions being indicated by carets and deleted material being placed between brackets. Claims must not be renumbered and the numbering of the claims added for reexamination must follow the number of the highest numbered patent claim. No amendment may enlarge the scope of the claims of the patent. No new matter may be introduced into the patent.

[32 FR 13583, Sept. 28, 1967; 46 FR 29183, May 29, 1981; para. (e), 49 FR 555, Jan. 4, 1984, effective Apr. 1, 1984]

608.01(i) Claims [R - 3]

37 CFR 1.75. Claims

(a) The specification must conclude with a claim particularly pointing out and distinctly

claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention or discovery.

(b) More than one claim may be presented provided they differ substantially from each other and are not unduly multiplied.

(c) One or more claims may be presented in dependent form, referring back to and further limiting another claim or claims in the same application. Any dependent claim which refers to more than one other claim ("multiple dependent claim") shall refer to such other claims in the alternative only. A multiple dependent claim shall not serve as a basis for any other multiple dependent claim. For fee calculation purposes under § 1.16, a multiple dependent claim will be considered to be that number of claims to which direct reference is made therein. For fee calculation purposes, also, any claim depending from a multiple dependent claim will be considered to be that number of claims to which direct reference is made in that multiple dependent claim. In addition to the other filing fees, any original application which is filed with, or is amended to include, multiple dependent claims must have paid therein the fee set forth in § 1.16(d). Claims in dependent form shall be construed to include all the limitations of the claim incorporated by reference into the dependent claim. A multiple dependent claim shall be construed to incorporate by reference all the limitations of each of the particular claims in relation to which it is being considered.

(d)(1) The claim or claims must conform to the invention as set forth in the remainder of the specification and the terms and phrases used in the claims must find clear support or antecedent basis in the description so that the meaning of the terms in the claims may be ascertainable by reference to the description (See § 1.58(a).)

(2) See § § 1.141 to 1.146 as to claiming different inventions in one application.

(e) Where the nature of the case admits, as in the case of an improvement, any independent claim should contain in the following order, (1) a preamble comprising a general description of all the elements or steps of the claimed combination which are conventional or known, (2) a phrase such as "wherein the improvement comprises," and (3) those elements, steps and/or relationships which constitute that portion of the claimed combination which the applicant considers as the new or improved portion.

(f) If there are several claims, they shall be numbered consecutively in Arabic numerals.

**>(g) The least restrictive claim should be presented as claim number 1, and all dependent claims should be grouped together with the claim or claims to which they refer to the extent practicable.

(h) The claim or claims must commence on a separate sheet.

(i) Where a claim sets forth a plurality of elements or steps, each element or step of the claim should be separated by a line indentation.<

608.01(m) Form of Claims [R - 3]

>The claim or claims must commence on a separate sheet and should appear after the detailed description of the invention.< While there is no set statutory form for claims, the present Office practice is to insist that each claim must be the object of a sentence starting with "I (or we) claim", "The invention claimed is" (or the equivalent). If, at the time of allowance, the quoted terminology is not present, it is inserted by the clerk. Each claim begins with a capital letter and ends with a period. Periods may not be used elsewhere in the claims except for abbreviations. See *Fressola v. Manbeck*, >36 USPQ2d 1211< (D.D.C. 1995). ** >Where a claim sets forth a plurality of elements or steps, each element or step of the claim should be separated by a line indentation, 37 CFR 1.75(i).<

There may be plural indentations to further segregate subcombinations or related steps. In general, the printed patent copies will follow the format used but printing difficulties or expense may prevent the duplication of unduly complex claim formats.

Reference characters corresponding to elements recited in the detailed description and the drawings may be used in conjunction with the recitation of the same element or group of elements in the claims. The reference characters, however, should be enclosed within parentheses so as to avoid confusion with other numbers or characters which may appear in the claims. The use of reference characters is to be considered as having no effect on the scope of the claims.

Many of the difficulties encountered in the prosecution of patent applications after final rejection may be alleviated if each applicant includes, at the time of filing or no later than the first response, claims varying from the broadest to which he or she believes he or she is entitled to the most detailed that he or she is willing to accept.

Claims should preferably be arranged in order of scope so that the first claim presented is the * >least restrictive<. >All dependent claims should be grouped together with the claim or claims to which they refer to the extent practicable.< Where separate species are claimed, the claims of like species should be grouped together where possible ** >.< Similarly, product and process claims should be separately grouped. Such arrangements are for the purpose of facilitating classification and examination.

The form of claim required in 37 CFR 1.75(e) is particularly adapted for the description of improvement - type inventions. It is to be considered a combination claim. The preamble of this form of claim is considered to positively and clearly include all the elements or steps recited therein as a part of the claimed combination.